

From: Nancy George
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 5:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ:

I am a self-employed developer implementing IBM and Microsoft applications. I find the prospect of punishing Microsoft's success the chilling result of a politically motivated witch-hunt, spurred on by competitors who won't release their own products to open systems standards.

Windows is not the only PC operating system. IBM used to offer OS2; it was not widely adopted because it was over-priced, IBM spent \$0 introducing OS2 to developers, and consumers choose not to buy it. There is the MAC and Linux. And much of the new software being developed is WEB based. Windows popularity is due to the fact that it is what people want. People choose Windows.

To a great extent, the acceptance and implementation of computers and the resulting productivity gains our economy has enjoyed, are a direct result of Microsoft products. When the first PCs were introduced, IBM did not want them to compete with IBM business computers. So they priced PCs out of reach of the average person. Microsoft's vision was to make them affordable and drive down the cost of computing so everyone would have a PC. IBM is still 8 times the size of Microsoft and could have competed in the PC market. They choose not to.

Microsoft drives innovation. I remember a few years ago, my project was held-up for 18 months because IBM and other vendors wouldn't participate in open standards definition. Finally Microsoft got fed up, and released a standard with the understanding that if the broader community ever got their act together, Microsoft would rework Windows to conform to the open standard.

The idea of not bundling new features into Windows is completely ridiculous. When I started my career, multiplication and division were SEPARATE PRODUCTS not included in the operating system. Applying the no bundling standard would mean the Windows operating system could not include multiplication and division because a third party offered the product. And what about graphics, e-mailing from Word, embedding or linking documents, launching a WEB page from a document ... the list could be pages long!

Instead of vilifying Microsoft for improving their products, why don't you charge Sun Microsystems for refusing to release Java to an open standards board? Why not go after AOL for refusing to allow access to their brand of messaging ... a condition of the merger with CNN? Why not recognize that the lawyers fighting Microsoft are provided by those very same competitors who want to over-price and under-develop their own offerings? Why not chastise IBM for spending 1/50th of what Microsoft budgets for developer training?

Settle this matter with as little impact to Microsoft software as possible. The remedy should affect business practices only.

Regards
Nancy George